REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON FINANCING OF HOMEMAKER/HOME CARE AGENCIES

SUBMITTED TO:

THE HONOURABLE GUY J. LEBLANC, MINISTER,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA

MARCH 7, 1989 **HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Department of Community Services wishes to acknowledge the support and involvement of persons within this department, other departments of government and Nova Scotian organizations.

Those who contributed to this report represent the:

Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities

Nova Scotia Association of Homemakers

Nova Scotia Home Care Advisory Committee

Department of Municipal Affairs

Department of Community Services:

Office of the Deputy Minister
Financial Services
Research, Planning and Management
Information Services
Family & Children's Services
Rehabilitation & Community Services
Coordinated Home Care

91-01299/

Nova Scotia

Department of
Community Services

PO Box 696
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2T7

Our phone no
Fax 902 424-0502

Our file no:

March 7, 1989

Honourable Guy J. LeBlanc
Minister,
Department of Community Services
Province of Nova Scotia
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Dear Sir:

On behalf of the Task Force membership it is with pleasure that I submit the **Report of the Task Force on Financing of Homemaker/Home Care Agencies**.

The Task Force would be pleased to meet with you, at your convenience, should you feel a verbal briefing is appropriate.

It is the sincere wish and anticipation of the Task Force membership that the recommendations contained herein will assist the Department of Community Services in implementing the Coordinated Home Care Program.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert P. Moody
Chairman,
Task Force on Financing of
Homemaker/Home Care Agencies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION			PAGE
1	Executive Summary		1
2	Historical Perspective, Homemaker Agencies		3
3	Summary of Issues		11
4	Summary of Financial Analysis		12
5	Recommendations		16
6	Appendices		
	I)	Terms of Reference	20
	II)	Task Force Membership	22
	III)	Definitions	23
	IV)	Financial Analysis Detail	24
	V)	User Fee Schedule	30

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The establishment of the Task Force on the Financing of Homemaker/Home Care Agencies was approved by the Minister of Community Services in late 1988. With the advent of most provincially-subsidized homemaker agencies becoming "entry points" into the now being implemented Coordinated Home Care Program, it was deemed appropriate that the financing of these agencies be reviewed to insure consistency, stability and suitable roles of the two primary funding agents, The Province of Nova Scotia and Nova Scotia's municipalities. Also, the Task Force was charged with examining the important funding components of client fee for service charges and local fundraising.

The Task Force began its work in January and the full Task Force met six times concluding with its last meeting on February 28, 1989. The Task Force has completed an historical overview of homemaking and the financing thereof which has allowed us to summarize nine key issues that impact upon current and future financing. The importance of providing financial stability to the Homemaker Program is compounded by the fact that they have been chosen as the entry points into the new Coordinated Home Care Program.

The Task Force considered four options for cost sharing and in examining and comparing and eliminating options, we considered five main criteria; stability, consistency, provincial/municipal cost sharing, role of local fund raising, and fee for service.

The Task Force has developed both a funding formula and a related funding process that we believe fully address the Terms of Reference given and the shortcomings in today's process. Our recommended solution would see all appropriate parties involved annually in negotiating service levels and approved budget maximums upon which the cost sharing would be based. The recommended solution would, we believe, see every client, municipality and homemaker agency treated equitably and consistently. Both formula and process represent an equal distribution of responsibility among the major partners and its simplicity and equity should lend the formula workable and enhance stability over time.

Once approved budgets have been established, our proposal would see the province cost sharing 75%. Revenues derived from user fees and local fundraising would then be applied with the balance of the approved budget would then be paid by the appropriate municipality.

We are recommending that a user fee be applied consistently across Nova Scotia and we have provided analysis and discussion on the implications of and rationale for the user fee proposed. Also contained within our seventeen recommendations are provisions intended to provide an incentive for local fundraising and also to provide for a transitional period from current practice to the recommended outcome.

In closing, our Task Force is confident that our recommendations will lead to stable, appropriate and consistent financing of these critically important homemaker/home care agencies.

2. HOMEMAKER SERVICES: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Preamble:

Homemaker Service is a specialized social service within the community and plays a major component part of comprehensive Home Care programming.

Homemaker Service aimed at providing help to families and individuals who need assistance in maintaining their independence and good general state of well being has always been a part of Nova Scotia life but occurred on an informal basis. For example, individuals and families who were no longer able to carry out certain of the activities required for day to day living were generally assisted via another family member, a neighbour or a church group and such support services were never called homemaker services per se, but fell within the framework of charity and/or responsibility for ones own family system or for ones neighbour. It was only when Municipal Governments developed to the degree that they were able to see a role for themselves in preserving the family unit, that an arm was extended beyond the very intimate family circle or neighbourhood of a client to assist with some of the problems that beset persons in their day to day living. Trends which saw a move away from extended family systems, as well as a decline in the responsibility one took for his neighbour caused both the Municipal and Provincial Governments to face and address a new responsibility and challenge in an area which was heretofore exclusive to the family and the neighbourhood.

A SHORT CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY:

1940's/1960's

The Canadian Red Cross Society as early as 1947 saw a role for its organization in the area of homemaker services provision, and was perhaps the Province's first or earliest homemaker agency. Throughout the fifties, and sixties homemaker services in Nova Scotia emerged on an ad hoc basis which were made possible via grants from Provincial, Municipal and latterly Federal Government. Unfortunately, services existed usually only for the duration of the grant monies. The Provincial Government role during this same period was limited to financial sharing with the Municipal Government through their General Assistance Program. In effect, this meant that homemaker assistance was available on a case to case basis only and there was little knowledge as to who would in fact be providing the service and for how long. There was no system of monitoring its value to the person in need nor was there a system to select the people who would be providing homemaker services in terms of their skills and suitability.

Over the years, occasional grants were made by the Department of Community Services, then Public Welfare to organizations throughout the

Province who proposed to develop a homemaker program, however, services under such arrangements were also short lived.

With the advent of the Canada Assistance Agreement (1967) a new impetus for the development of new social programs and enrichment of existing social programs was realized. However, various attempts by the Department of Community Services to launch a formalized system of homemaker services throughout the seventies were met without success and at the same time the number of institutional settings for the care of elderly and disabled persons increased. This seemingly was a priority direction at that time and was not essentially peculiar to Nova Scotia. It may be perceived in some sense as an equal and opposite reaction to the changes that were taking place in family life where there was, in effect, a move away from extended family systems with grandparent figures and other relatives performing important physical and psychological roles in family life.

1970's

The years between 1972-74 saw the Federal Governments Local Initiatives Program at a peak and as many as 15 organizations launched homemaker services employing 92 Homemakers. As these monies petered out so did the services and the Provincial Government did not respond to the efforts of those seeking to be funded on a continuous basis.

In January 1974, a Task Force on Homemaker Services was appointed through the Nova Scotia Social Services Council. The Department of Social Services sponsored a Conference on Homemaker Services in an effort to consolidate the work of various groups and stimulate public awareness and support for Homemaker Services. In September 1974, the Task Force Report on Homemaker Services presented their final report to the Nova Scotia Social Services Council. Their report was exhaustive although perhaps light in terms of development of cost estimates. Their conclusion was that Homemaker Services was "resting in an unpleasant hiatus with no funding scheme to keep agencies operating".

In early 1978, the Minister of Social Services established an Advisory Committee to study and to make recommendations with respect to the implementation of a Homemaker Services Program. This action was

precipitated by an earlier Brief prepared for the Minister of Social Services by the Nova Scotia Family and Child Welfare Association. Their Brief contended that such a program could in a large measure assist in the preservation of independent family living and compliment the aims and goals of the already established social programs.

Their major recommendations were:

1. The principal financing of homemaker services should be the responsibility of and be undertaken by the Province of Nova Scotia with -

   (a) A sliding fee scale which allows individuals receiving the service to assume part of the costs themselves. The minimum charge to a recipient of services would be included in the scale.

   (b) Complete Provincial subsidization for those persons needing homemaker services who are in receipt of Provincial Social Assistance and/or Municipal Social Assistance.

2. Either through budgeting and/or through a method of subsidization by grants, assistance should be provided to cover loss by volunteer groups initiating homemaker service programs. This would cover the cost of operation beyond the control of volunteer groups such as fluctuation of operational costs, inflationary trends or the like. This could be provided in the form of maximum approved budgeting or in reimbursing "proven losses" up to a set maximum percentage of the budget.

They proposed the following Plan of Action.

STAGE I **PROVINCIAL LEVEL**

1. Appointment of Provincial Coordinator of Homemaker Services.

2. Assignment of responsibilities to Regional Administrators and District Supervisors.

3. Drafting of Homemakers Act and Regulations.

4. Arrangements for interim financial support for existing services.

5. Discussions with Canada Manpower and the Department of Education regarding Training Programs.

6. Planning of a public information program.

STAGE II **DISTRICT LEVEL**

1. Establishment of local Coordinating Committees.

2. Preparation of budget proposals.

3. Ensure conformity to acceptable standards.

STAGE III **DISTRICT LEVEL - "Underdeveloped Districts"**

1. Search for organizing agencies, public and private.

2. Recruitments of supervisors and homemakers.

3. Community-wide public information program.

STAGE IV **ALL LEVELS**

1. Establishment of a system of regular evaluation of all aspects of the service throughout the province.

The new Advisory Committee accordingly studied homemaker services programming and presented the Minister of Social Services with basic Guidelines. The basic Guidelines for the Homemaker Services Program covered such essential elements as target populations, vehicles of service delivery, funding formulae, staffing standards (minimal), and administrative requirements. The target populations chosen were senior citizens, disabled persons and families at risk or in crisis; and the selected or authorized service delivery bodies were Municipalities, non-profit community organizations and Family and Children's Services Agencies. These Guidelines effectively formed the basis or principle documentation on which the Homemaker Services Program derived its authority over the succeeding three years.

In November of 1978, the Government of Nova Scotia sanctioned the establishment of a Subsidized Homemaker Services Program and provided a small amount of money ($68,000.) to stimulate the growth and development of programs around the Province. A Program Director was appointed.

The funding formula used was based on the old Education Foundation Scale which provided for a percentage sharing between the Province and the sponsoring homemaker agency, the larger portion being assumed by the Province.

This approach to funding had inherent problems in that the Education Foundation Scale having been, at the time, considered obsolete or invalid as a relevant funding mechanism in other Municipal/Provincial fiscal negotiations, was being put into effect for one of the Provinces' newest programs. As well, because of the administrative structure of the Agencies relative to providing service coverage, a blend of percentages was used for several Municipal jurisdictions and an average percentage used as the fixed sharing rate.

At the time, three child welfare agencies in Nova Scotia were operating teaching homemaker service units as part of their agency's protection service and it was decided that they would be provided with 100% of their funding requirements for this service to be diminished to no less then 75% over the following three year period.

In this very short period of three years the Child Welfare Agencies were challenged with a new financial problem, as 25% of their program costs had to be derived from other of their funds in order to fulfil the 75/25 agreement with the Province. The well documented value of the Program as a major tool in the Casework process of keeping families together did not allow the three Agencies to easily opt out of the program and they of course did not.

The initial child welfare agencies engaged in teaching homemaker services were the Children's Aid Society of Halifax, the Children's Aid Society of Pictou and the Family and Children's Services of Kings.

The Province at this time with its total of 12 Children's Aid Societies and 4 District Offices of the Department of Social Services providing Child Welfare Services, was in the peculiar situation of funding homemaker services (teaching) to a select number and by the time the positive effects of the program became known, the bulk of the Homemaker Program appropriation

was being consumed for services to seniors. There was fiscal restraint sufficient to prevent any further development of homemaker services of a teaching type within the other Child Welfare Agencies.

1980 - 1988

A very significant growth in the number of agencies to engage with the Province in providing Homemaker Services occurred throughout the early 1980's and the small budget of $68,000. had increased to 1.6 million dollars by the end of the fiscal year 1981-82. Escalation in the financial growth of this new social program was unprecedented.

In 1981, the relatively new Senior Citizens Secretariat was given the mandate to implement two Home Care pilot projects in two different regions of the Province. This was a deliberate attempt to ascertain all of the implications (including very importantly cost implications) that would emerge as a result of delivering a Coordinated Home Care Program. The Departments of Community Services, Housing and Health and Fitness worked diligently together on these projects under the monitorship of the Secretariat. After the two year duration of their efforts, no solid directions or actions were taken to move into the delivery of a Coordinated Home Care Program. These projects had a very influential effect on the public perception of Homemaker Services and Home Care in that they were seen to be exclusively seniors programs and the remaining target population was become increasingly attentive to the program that was intended to serve their needs as well. A second Advisory Committee on Homemaker Services which was set up to advise the Department on a continuing basis about matters which were felt to be regionally unique and relevant for a new and developing program, reported on the profound and positive effect that this new Homemaker Services Program was having in each area of Nova Scotia and pressed for legislation which they felt would give a stable and permanent base to the program. In February of 1982 the Homemaker Services Act and Regulations were proclaimed which was viewed as an achievement of major significance throughout the Province. The program now having a legislative base gave stability to the program which was strongly promoted by the Advisory Committee and it confirmed the commitment of Government to provide and to develop such an important family support service.

With 38 organizations or agencies engaged in the provision of Homemaker Services with the Department by the end of the fiscal year 1982, a great interest prevailed in establishing an Association of Homemaker Agencies. By the end of that fiscal year a sum of $10,000. was provided by the

Department of Social Services to assist the body of persons desirous of forming an Association. In the Fall of that same year the Nova Scotia Association of Homemaker Services was formally incorporated which marked the beginning of a very important relationship between the Provincial Government and the sponsors of Homemaker Services Programs.

By the beginning of the fiscal year 1983-84 the Department of Community Services fell into a period of fiscal restraint which over the succeeding four years created great financial stress on homemaker program sponsors. Percentage increases over previous years approved budgets were the order of the day and after a period of four years, the reconciliation of Agency Budgets vis a vis approved dollars was entirely out of the realm of reasonableness.

The following graph portrays the growth of the Homemaker Services Program since its inception with respect to expenditures, number of agencies and client population.

FISCAL YEAR	PROVINCIAL SHARE	CLIENTELE	NUMBER OF AGENCIES
1978-79	$ 66,198.	----	10
1979-80	$ 736,550.	----	29
1980-81	$1,084,075.	1598	33
1981-82	$1,606,383.	1750	38
1982-83	$1,618,470.	2250	42
1983-84	$1,856,698.	3000	42
1984-85	$2,573,507.	4870	43
1985-86	$2,775,689.	4900	45
1986-87	$3,256,131.	5000	46
1987-88	$3,331,298.	5100	45
1988-89	$5,416,000.	5300	50

The mid eighties were very crucial years for the Homemaker Services Program in that its popularity and value were increasing at a very rapid pace. At the same time the financial restraint by Government that was being vigorously pursued not only for Homemaker Services but for all of the social programs was taking its toll on service delivery and Provincial credibility.

The major imbalance in the demand for service with its cost implications vis a vis the cost sharing that was provided by the Department of Community Services for these services has been perhaps one of the most outstanding negative influences that is part of the Homemaker Programs developmental history.

In 1985, the government introduced the Home Life Supports program. Along with other initiatives to assist senior citizens and disabled persons to remain in their own homes, there was a provision to provide some financial assistance to homemaker agencies in order to expand their services. Because this opportunity was available for only a short period of time, not all homemaker agencies were able to take advantage of it.

As an interim measure and to alleviate the financial pressure that was being experienced by all Homemaker Services Program sponsors, a Ministerial directive was initiated in the fiscal year 1986 which in the long run served to confuse or complicate the Municipal/Provincial cost sharing arrangement. The Department with its already complex formula approach (from which there had been a four year departure) was adding yet another mechanism for cost sharing that was applied exclusively to Municipal Homemaker Program Sponsors.

In spite of the very difficult financial times that were experienced over the years between 1984 and 1989, the public generally and the Homemaker Agencies particularly were able to sustain a commitment to the value of the program. As the principals of the Special Committee of Deputy Ministers et. al. moved about the Province to study the status of Home Care and to learn what people were asking for by way of a program in their Province, it is noteworthy that among the salient characteristics of their study, the Homemaker Agency was identified as being the suitable and appropriate point of entry for a Coordinated Home Care Program.

The following section is a summary of the issues or concerns that arise from a decade of experience in administering the Homemaker Services program throughout the Province.

3. SUMMARY OF ISSUES ARISING FROM THE HISTORY OF HOMEMAKER SERVICES FUNDING

1. Complex variations in the funding formula between the Province and the service Agency.

2. Funding authority based in part on Legislation and in part on Ministerial directive creates an unstable and inherently problematic basis for funding negotiations.

3. Funding formula in place not mutually developed (Provincial/Municipal).

4. Funding responsibilities of Municipality vis a vis non profit Homemaker Agencies serving their jurisdictions not clearly enunciated.

5. Differences in program sponsorship (while not inappropriate) creates a cost sharing formula challenge.

6. No regulations or definitive guidelines with respect to "user fees". Some sponsors apply a user fee (less than 50%) while others do not thus making access unequal across the Province.

7. Municipal autonomy in service delivery particularly with reference to income assessment has tended to lead the Program away from Standardization and in areas it has become prohibitive to persons needing and seeking homemaker services.

8. Changes in the original funding formula resulted in a shift in the balance of costs from the Province to other sources of funding.

9. The importance of providing stability to the Homemaker Program is compounded by the fact that they have been chosen as the entry points for the new Coordinated home Care Program.

4. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The Task Force considered five criteria in the formulation of its funding options.

Stability:

The ability of any proposed funding formula to "withstand the test of time" was deemed critical to its acceptability. The continued increase in the level of Homemaker Services to Nova Scotians under the umbrella of Coordinated Home Care will not occur without increasing costs to the delivering agencies. The commitment of the major contributors to Homemaker Services has been clearly demonstrated. The retention of that commitment needed to be solidified by delineating the responsibilities of each player and allowing for participatory establishment of funding levels.

Consistency:

The availability of Coordinated Home Care to all Nova Scotians highlights the need for a universal and equitable method of determining the levels of funding to all Homemaker Agencies.

Provincial/Municipal Cost Sharing:

The appropriateness of Provincial versus Municipal contributions to Homemaker Agencies was a major factor in determining proposed funding formulas. Until 1988-89 Nova Scotias municipalities have, for the past number of years, carried an ever increasing share of Homemaker funding. Proposed funding options had to ensure such "slippage" would not occur in future.

Role of Local Fund Raising:

Many of the 15 private Homemaker Agencies derive a significant portion of their revenue through fund raising. Any funding formula had to provide an incentive for agencies to continue this practice but at the same time provide alternate funding should their efforts fall short of expectations.

Fee for Service:

The concept of a universally applied User Fee was to be considered for at least one funding option. The Task Force decided to consider each option with and without a universal user fee. A Summary of the Task Force deliberations on this subject follows.

Funding Options:

The Task Force considered four options for cost sharing.

The allocation of funding among the various contributors was applied consistently in the following manner and in all cases would be based on an approved budget established through joint negotiation. (Recommendation 1)

1. The Province would provide a fixed percentage of the approved budget. (Recommendation 2)

2. User Fees Revenue would be applied. (Recommendations 3 and 7)

3. Fifty percent of Fund Raising Revenue would be applied. (Recommendations 3 and 13)

4. The balance would be assumed by the Municipalities served by the Agency. (Recommendation 4)

The options considered were:

1) apply the above formula with the existing Provincial/Agency cost sharing ratios (without the universal user fee component) and retaining fees now collected by eighteen Homemaker Agencies

2) apply the formula (without the universal user fee component) but standardize the Provincial/Agency funding ratios at 75/25

3) apply the full formula (with universal user fee) with the original Provincial/Agency cost sharing ratios

4) apply the formula (with universal user fee) to a standardized Provincial/Agency funding ratio of 75/25

The first and second options were rejected because they did not allow for a universally applied user fee component. The Task Force concluded that such a provision would provide "dignity through obligation" for the client and was therefore favourable. This is consistent with the findings of the Deputy Ministers Report (1987) which was adopted by Government in June 1987.

The third option was rejected because it did not meet the criteria of consistency. The nineteen agencies which now receive a nominal sharing rate greater than 75% acquired that position by virtue of being active in 1982 when the Homemaker Services Act and Regulations were enacted and equate to the Education Foundation Scale last amended in 1976 and which no longer exits. The Task Force on The Levels of Cost Sharing of Municipal Assistance (1988) concluded that the Education Foundation Scale no longer represents an equitable vehicle for the determination of cost sharing.

Only the fourth option - a universal 75/25 Provincial/Agency funding, applied through the advocated formula, met all the criteria established by the Task Force including the adaptation of a universal user fee. It allows for standardized treatment of all Agencies and provides for a definable allocation of funding among the contributors. The level of 75/25 follows the recommendations of the Task Force on The Levels of Cost Sharing of Municipal Assistance; provides for cost sharing consistent with other programs and is currently in affect for the majority of Homemaker Agencies.

A comparative summary of the funding options is contained in the following chart.

Financial Impacts:

The following are the overall impacts, based on 1987/88 expenditures, of introducing the recommended funding changes outlined in the following chart:

. Provincial costs will increase approximately $225,000., or 7.3%;

. Municipal costs will decrease $340,000., or 42%;

. Income from user fees will increase $170,000., or 43%;

It is not possible to draw conclusions about the impact of user fees, municipal contributions and other revenues on individual agencies from the table because the estimates are based on the experience of a sample of agencies. However, the provincial contribution is based on actual costs for 1987/88 so reflects accurately the situation at that time. To determine the exact amount from other sources, each agency should complete its own estimate based on actual data for caseload and revenues.

Although it is not possible to estimate specific impacts on individual agencies and municipal units, some general conclusions can be reached. Additional municipal contributions will be needed where provincial cost-sharing now exceeds 75% and/or where user fees exceed those recommended by the Task Force. In most cases, increases in user fees will offset reductions in provincial cost-sharing. It is estimated that increased municipal contributions will be required by four agencies only.

SUMMARY OF FUNDING OPTIONS
WITH AND WITHOUT FEDERAL COST SHARING
Based on the 1987/88 Provincial Fiscal Year

Funding Option	Funding Formula	1987/88 Contributions						Contribution Percentage				
		Govt Canada	Province	Munic	User	Other	Total	Federal	Prov	Munic	User	Other
1987/88 Actual	Current sharing ratios	0	3,088,433	807,241	399,737	122,542	4,417,953	0.0%	69.9%	18.3%	9.0%	2.8%
	with imposed Provincial funding maximum	1,850,445	1,237,988	807,241	399,737	122,542	4,417,953	41.9%	28.0%	18.3%	9.0%	2.8%
Option 1	Current sharing ratios on negotiated budget	0	3,460,755	543,569	343,294	70,335	4,417,953	0.0%	78.3%	12.3%	7.8%	1.6%
		1,902,054	1,558,701	543,569	343,294	70,335	4,417,953	43.1%	35.3%	12.3%	7.8%	1.6%
Option 2	75/25 sharing ratio on negotiated budget	0	3,313,465	680,494	353,659	70,335	4,417,953	0.0%	75.0%	15.4%	8.0%	1.6%
		1,897,131	1,416,334	680,494	353,659	70,335	4,417,953	42.9%	32.1%	15.4%	8.0%	1.6%
Option 3	Current sharing ratios on negotiated budget with User Fee Proposal	0	3,460,755	334,245	558,187	64,766	4,417,953	0.0%	78.3%	7.6%	12.6%	1.5%
		1,802,625	1,658,130	334,245	558,187	64,766	4,417,953	40.8%	37.5%	7.6%	12.6%	1.5%
Option 4	75/25 sharing ratio on negotiated budget with User Fee Proposal	0	3,313,465	466,148	573,575	64,765	4,417,953	0.0%	75.0%	10.6%	13.0%	1.5%
		1,795,316	1,518,149	466,148	573,575	64,765	4,417,953	40.6%	34.4%	10.6%	13.0%	1.5%

Formula for sharing under the Welfare Services component of the Canada Assistance Plan

Sharing is based on - 1. Provincial and Municipal payments to Approved Home Care Agency
- 2. Costs related to subsidized clients (those meeting the Income Guidelines)
- 3. Expenditures only include Salaries, Travel and Staff Training.

NOTE: Provincial Payments + Municipal Payments + User Fees from Subsidized Clients cannot exceed total cost allocated to Subsidized Clients
i.e. Shareable amount would be the lesser of actual Provincial/Municipal Cost or Total Costs on Subsidized Clients less User Fees from Subsidized Clients

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Preamble:

The Task Force has developed both a funding formula and a related funding process that we believe fully address the terms of reference given and shortcomings in today's process which we have documented.

Our recommended solution, one of four options explored, would see every client, municipality and Homemaker Agency treated equitably and consistently. Both the formula and the process are straight forward and represent, we believe, an equitable distribution of funding among the major partners. The simplicity and equity should lend the formula workable and enhance stability over time.

A user fee formula has been recommended as was recommended in the Deputy Ministers' Report on Coordinated Home Care (1987). The Task Force believes a user fee to be appropriate to both the client and the taxpayer and workable within the parameters of our recommendations.

Local fund raising has been encouraged via a special treatment in the funding formula. Also, the Task Force has commented on service components that should remain the responsibility of the Province and those that should be subject to cost-sharing.

Lastly, we have applied our recommended formula to historical data available for the 1987/88 fiscal year and have provided a projection of what would have resulted. More accurate and more current projections would best be managed at a local level where local data is most current and local assumptions best known.

Our specific recommendations are presented under the following headings: Formula and Process, User Fee, Transition and Other.

Formula and Process:

It is recommended that,

1. Annually, the service level and therefore budget approval be negotiated and set with each Homemaker/Home Care Agency

between the period April 1 - June 30 (earlier if possible) for that fiscal year April 1 - March 31. The Department of Community Services, Home Care Division would organize and chair the sessions with senior representation from the appropriate municipalities and each agency.

2. Of the negotiated/approved budget, the Province would fund 75%, payable in quarterly advances.

3. Of the balance, (25%), revenues collected from client user fees would be applied and, next, 50% of local fund raising would be applied to funding requirements. (Further detail on both user fees and fund raising are provided in subsequent recommendations.)

4. The balance remaining would then be paid by the appropriate Municipality; (i.e. 25% less user fees, less 50% of local fund raising equals balance to be paid by the Municipality).

5. The municipal contribution be payable in the form of a quarterly grant to the agency, payable in advance, based upon the previous quarter's actual service utilization.

6. The funding process and formula outlined in recommendations #1-5 above be implemented effective April 1, 1989.

<u>USER FEE</u>:

7. The following User Fee be implemented:

   (a) no charge for recipients receiving Family Benefits or Municipal Social Assistance.

   (b) $2.25 <u>per visit</u> for clients with income above assistance levels and midway along the income level allowed under the Family Size and Income Guidelines; (see Appendix V)

   (c) $4.50 <u>per visit</u> for clients with income between the midpoint and the maximum income allowed under the Family Size and Income Guidelines; (see Appendix V)

(d) no client should be charged for more than 5 visits per week.

(e) each agency must be sensitive to exceptional cases where collection of all or part of the user fee might impose an unacceptable hardship. Therefore, no person should be denied services because of their inability to pay, nor can they be considered eligible for Municipal Social Assistance to pay user fees.

8. The User Fee amount be established annually, consistent in timing with the annual adjustment of the Family Size and Income Guidelines.

9. The Financial Services and Audit Services Divisions of the Department of Community Services compile a policy and procedure directive documenting at least one and preferably two, cost-efficient accounting/collection procedures based on current experience and practice.

10. Following the completion of one full year of implementation, the overall structure and rate levels of the user fee be reviewed to ensure suitability.

Transition:

11. The transition from the current effective provincial sharing rate, where it is currently above 75%, to 75% should be phased in consistent with the transitional recommendations of the Task Force on Municipal Social Assistance (1988).

12. Homemaker/Home Care Agencies currently charging User Fees in excess of the formula recommended be given up to 6 months to negotiate a transitional plan and up to 24 months to implement same. Both time frames are from the time this Report is adopted. These negotiations would be chaired and organized by the Home Care Division of the Department of Community Services and would involve senior representation from the Agency and the appropriate municipalities.

Other:

13. Local Homemaker/Home Care Agencies continue to be encouraged to undertake local fundraising in support of local Home Care Priorities. Up to 50% of such funds should be permitted to be held in reserve, up to a maximum of $10,000., for such items as

    (a) staff training and conference items supplemental to provincially sponsored training;

    (b) training resource materials;

    (c) local sponsorship of complimentary volunteer initiatives;

    (d) other items directly in support of Coordinated Home Care as pre-approved by the Director of Homemaker Services.

14. The status quo of items of expenditure currently cost-shared in Homemaker/Home Care Agencies be maintained and, likewise, items now considered the full responsibility of the Province remain as is. More specifically homemaking, (social) assessment, local home care coordination, case management and agency management functions should continue to be cost-shared under the proposed formula. Nursing services, (nursing) assessments and Regional Home Care Coordination would remain Provincial responsibilities.

15. Financial analysis beyond that contained in this report can best be undertaken at the local (municipal and agency) level with Provincial assistance being available as required.

16. The current practice, enacted in 1988, of funding Family Skills Workers (Teaching Homemakers) employed in Child Welfare Agencies continue to be a Provincial responsibility.

17. The Regulations under the Homemakers Services Act be ammended to adequately reflect the above recommendations.

APPENDIX I
Terms of Reference
for the Task Force on the Financing of
Homemaker/Home Care Agencies

A) Background:

The establishment of the Task Force on the Financing of Homemaker/Home Care Agencies was approved by the Honourable Thomas J. McInnis in October 1988. With the advent of most provincially-subsidized homemaker agencies becoming "entry-points" into the now being implemented Coordinated Home Care Program, it was deemed appropriate that the financing of these agencies be reviewed to ensure consistency, stability and suitable roles of the two primary funding sources, the Province of Nova Scotia and Nova Scotia's Municipalities.

B) Tasks:

1. To document the evolution of Homemaker Agencies in Nova Scotia from 1978 to present, giving particular emphasis to the evolution of financing.

2. To delineate any shortcomings of today's financing including, if applicable:

   - inconsistent provincial/municipal financing
   - local fundraising
   - fee for service charges

3. To place before the Minister of Community Services financially oriented recommendations that will support the long term financing of Homemaker/Home Care Agencies, and addresses:

   - stability
   - consistency
   - appropriate provincial/municipal cost sharing
   - role of local fund raising
   - level and appropriateness of fee-for-service
   - delineate items to be provincially/municipally and cost-shared and those Home Care items to be solely borne by one funding partner (e.g. Regional Home Care Coordinators to be funded by Province of Nova Scotia).
   - for each alternative of provincial/municipal cost-sharing developed, it shall be accompanied by a full cost analysis.

C) Task Force Membership:

1. Department of Community Services
   - Home Care Division (3)
   - Rehabilitation & Community Services Division (1)
   - Family & Children's Services Division (1)
   - Office of the Deputy Minister (1)
   - Financial Services Division (1)
   - Research, Planning and M.I.S. (1)
2. Department of Municipal Affairs (2)
3. N. S. Union of Municipalities (3)
4. N. S. Home Care Advisory Committee (1)
5. N. S. Association of Homemakers (1)

D) Timing:

The work of the Task Force should begin no later than January 2, 1989 and shall conclude no later than February 28, 1989.

E) Expenses:

Reasonable travel expenses for Task Force members, non-provincial employees, will be reimbursed by the Department of Community Services.

APPENDIX II

TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Robert Moody, Coordinated Home Care, (Chairman),
Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia
Councillor Sharon Byers, Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities
Mayor Earle Hood, Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities
Sherman Zwicker, Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities
Maureen Ahern, Nova Scotia Home Care Advisory Committee
Sam Cummings, Nova Scotia Association of Homemaker Services
Melissa Raymond, Department of Municipal Affairs,
Province of Nova Scotia
Roger Angevine, Financial Services Division, Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia
Peter Barteaux, Rehabilitation & Community Services, Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia
James MacKinnon, Office of the Deputy Minister, Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia
Elizabeth McNaughton, Research, Planning & Management Information Services, Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia
Rosemary Rippon, Family & Children's Services, Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia
Stewart Brown, Coordinated Home Care, Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia
Mary Ledwell, Coordinated Home Care, Department of Community Services, Province of Nova Scotia

SUB-COMMITTEES

Historical Perspective
Stewart Brown, Chairman
Sharon Byers
Sam Cummings
Rosemary Rippon

Financial/Funding Options
Roger Angevine, Chairman
Maureen Ahern
Peter Barteaux
Earle Hood
Elizabeth McNaughton

User Fee
Elizabeth McNaughton, Chair
Earle Hood
James MacKinnon
Melissa Raymond

APPENDIX III

DEFINITIONS

Homemaker Services:

Those essential activities carried out on behalf of a client which may include household management, personal care, child management and other social services conducive to the well-being of the client.

Homemaker Agency:

A municipal unit; society incorporated under the Children Services Act; or a non-profit organization providing Homemaker Services as per the Homemaker Services Act (1981).

Home Care Agency:

A homemaker agency which is a designated entry point for Coordinated Home Care.

In-Home Support Program:

Needy senior citizens or disabled persons receiving full or part time care from a family member (special equipment may also be involved) to enable them to remain independent in their own home and community. These persons who would otherwise require placement in a Home for Special Care may be eligible for up to 400 per month from their respective Municipality if the Municipality has an established In-Home Support Program approved by the Department of Community Services for cost-sharing.

Families-at-Risk:

Those families who are in danger of breakdown due to their inability to cope with their child care responsibilities and require help in order to gain or regain the status of independent living. Health problems, abuse and neglect or the potential for any of these situations are usually attending characteristics of the family at risk.

APPENDIX IV

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND DETAIL

TABLE 1	Actual Funding 1987/88
TABLE 2	Funding Under Option 1
TABLE 3	Funding Under Option 2
TABLE 4	Funding Under Option 3
TABLE 5	Funding Under Option 4

TABLE 1

FUNDING OF HOMEMAKER AGENCIES
REGULAR FUNDING TO AGENCIES AND 50/50 FUNDING WITH MUNICIPALITIES
For the Fiscal Year 1987/88

Name of Homemaker Agency	Sharing Ratio	1987/88 Blended Contributions Province	Munic	User	Other	Total	Surplus/ Deficit	Actual Cost	Blended Contribution Percentage Prov	Munic	User	Other
Antigonish County	92.0%	23,942	7,398	0	0	31,339	0	31,339	76.4%	23.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Munic of Argyle	81.3%	85,093	16,268	0	0	101,360	0	101,360	84.0%	16.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barrington/Clarks Harbour	85.0%	42,848	12,940	0	0	55,788	0	55,788	76.8%	23.2%	0.0%	0.0%
District of Clare	88.0%	39,501	11,355	0	0	50,855	0	50,855	77.7%	22.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Digby County	82.0%	50,309	28,494	0	0	78,803	0	78,803	63.8%	36.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Digby	75.0%	22,334	12,584	382	2,376	37,675	0	37,675	59.3%	33.4%	1.0%	6.3%
Dominion Visiting Homemakers	75.0%	22,111	6,646	2,449	0	31,206	(1,746)	32,952	70.9%	21.3%	7.8%	0.0%
Town of Glace Bay	75.0%	84,364	29,065	9,047	2,000	124,476	0	124,476	67.8%	23.3%	7.3%	1.6%
Guysborough County	91.0%	108,364	15,197	0	0	123,560	2,429	121,131	87.7%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Halifax County	78.0%	186,995	152,762	0	15,452	355,209	0	355,209	52.6%	43.0%	0.0%	4.4%
City of Halifax	75.0%	124,303	37,324	378	0	162,005	0	162,005	76.7%	23.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Inverness County	75.0%	80,232	19,311	6,971	1,178	107,692	0	107,692	74.5%	17.9%	6.5%	1.1%
Kings County	75.0%	87,961	37,794	2,795	0	128,549	0	128,549	68.4%	29.4%	2.2%	0.0%
Town of Lockeport	75.0%	6,271	896	0	0	7,167	0	7,167	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Mulgrave	81.0%	20,789	4,876	0	0	25,665	0	25,665	81.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Port Hawesbury	75.0%	44,663	5,520	3,579	0	53,761	0	53,761	83.1%	10.3%	6.7%	0.0%
Richmond County	75.0%	66,649	21,759	6,437	0	94,845	2,487	92,358	70.3%	22.9%	6.8%	0.0%
Munic of Shelburne	75.0%	2,994	998	0	0	3,992	0	3,992	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Shelburne	75.0%	11,324	4,604	0	0	15,928	0	15,928	71.1%	28.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Hants Co Homemakers	77.0%	206,211	92,928	4,614	0	303,752	0	303,752	67.9%	30.6%	1.5%	0.0%
Town of Yarmouth	81.3%	35,824	16,093	0	0	51,917	0	51,917	69.0%	31.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yarmouth County	81.3%	79,992	13,291	0	0	93,282	0	93,282	85.8%	14.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Totals Municipal Agencies		1,433,070	548,099	36,652	21,006	2,038,826	3,170	2,035,656	70.3%	26.9%	1.8%	1.0%
F & C S of Annapolis	78.0%	75,525	9,375	18,034	500	103,434	(5,195)	108,629	73.0%	9.1%	17.4%	0.5%
Antigonish & Area Homemakers	83.5%	76,856	3,600	10,662	493	91,611	(432)	92,043	83.9%	3.9%	11.6%	0.5%
F & C S of Colchester	75.0%	125,271	59,101	4,677	0	189,048	(4,055)	193,103	66.3%	31.3%	2.5%	0.0%
F & C S of Cumberland	81.0%	90,300	21,474	0	5,303	117,076	(4,980)	122,056	77.1%	18.3%	0.0%	4.5%
Dartmouth Community Homemakers	75.0%	142,350	6,500	46,032	14,992	209,874	11,149	198,725	67.8%	3.1%	21.9%	7.1%
Family Service of Support	75.0%	94,240	16,000	0	60,773	171,013	0	171,013	55.1%	9.4%	0.0%	35.5%
Homemakers Bureau	75.0%	98,443	16,912	32,680	502	148,537	5,452	143,085	66.3%	11.4%	22.0%	0.3%
F & C S of Lunenburg	75.0%	133,570	48,226	14,800	4,630	201,225	10,270	190,955	66.4%	24.0%	7.4%	2.3%
New Waterford Homemakers	93.0%	156,372	11,744	10,770	0	178,886	(1,650)	180,536	87.4%	6.6%	6.0%	0.0%
Northside Homemakers	81.0%	70,197	6,400	10,654	3,695	90,946	(1,131)	92,077	77.2%	7.0%	11.7%	4.1%
Pictou Co Visiting Homemakers	78.0%	102,456	3,700	26,892	9,750	142,798	165	142,633	71.7%	2.6%	18.8%	6.8%
Queens Co Homemakers	75.0%	83,829	25,865	1,145	0	110,838	2,312	108,526	75.6%	23.3%	1.0%	0.0%
Red Cross Homemakers	75.0%	227,820	0	133,731	12,007	373,558	(11,314)	384,872	61.0%	0.0%	35.8%	3.2%
St. Marys Homemaker Service	84.0%	81,842	0	37,357	640	119,839	4,672	115,167	68.3%	0.0%	31.2%	0.5%
Sydney Homemakers Society	75.0%	96,295	30,248	15,651	2,762	144,955	6,078	138,877	66.4%	20.9%	10.8%	1.9%
Totals Private Agencies		1,655,364	259,143	363,085	116,047	2,393,638	11,341	2,382,297	69.2%	10.8%	15.2%	4.8%
Grand Totals		3,088,433	807,241	399,737	137,053	4,432,464	14,511	4,417,953	69.7%	18.2%	9.0%	3.1%

TABLE 2

FUNDING OPTION 1
CURRENT SHARING RATIOS WITHOUT UNIVERSAL USER FEE
Applied to Data From the Fiscal Year 1987/88

Name of Homemaker Agency	Sharing Ratio	Calculated 1977/88 Contributions					Contribution Percentage			
		Province	Munic	User	Other	Total	Prov	Munic	User	Other
Antigonish County	92.0%	28,832	2,507	0	0	31,339	92.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Munic of Argyle	81.3%	82,406	18,954	0	0	101,360	81.3%	18.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Barrington/Clarks Harbour	85.0%	47,420	8,368	0	0	55,788	85.0%	15.0%	0.0%	0.0%
District of Clare	88.0%	44,752	6,103	0	0	50,855	88.0%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Digby County	82.0%	64,618	14,185	0	0	78,803	82.0%	18.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Digby	75.0%	28,256	7,849	382	1,188	37,675	75.0%	20.8%	1.0%	3.2%
Dominion Visiting Homemakers	75.0%	24,714	5,789	2,449	0	32,952	75.0%	17.6%	7.4%	0.0%
Town of Glace Bay	75.0%	93,357	21,072	9,047	1,000	124,476	75.0%	16.9%	7.3%	0.8%
Guysborough County	91.0%	110,229	10,902	0	0	121,131	91.0%	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Halifax County	78.0%	277,063	70,420	0	7,726	355,209	78.0%	19.8%	0.0%	2.2%
City of Halifax	75.0%	121,504	40,123	378	0	162,005	75.0%	24.8%	0.2%	0.0%
Inverness County	75.0%	80,769	19,363	6,971	589	107,692	75.0%	18.0%	6.5%	0.5%
Kings County	75.0%	96,412	29,342	2,795	0	128,549	75.0%	22.8%	2.2%	0.0%
Town of Lockeport	75.0%	5,375	1,792	0	0	7,167	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Mulgrave	81.0%	20,789	4,876	0	0	25,665	81.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Port Hawesbury	75.0%	40,321	9,861	3,579	0	53,761	75.0%	18.3%	6.7%	0.0%
Richmond County	75.0%	69,269	16,653	6,437	0	92,358	75.0%	18.0%	7.0%	0.0%
Munic of Shelburne	75.0%	2,994	998	0	0	3,992	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Shelburne	75.0%	11,946	3,982	0	0	15,928	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hants Co Homemakers	77.0%	233,889	65,249	4,614	0	303,752	77.0%	21.5%	1.5%	0.0%
Town of Yarmouth	81.3%	42,209	9,708	0	0	51,917	81.3%	18.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Yarmouth County	81.3%	75,838	17,444	0	0	93,282	81.3%	18.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Totals Municipal Agencies		1,602,961	385,540	36,652	10,503	2,035,656	78.7%	18.9%	1.8%	0.5%
F & C S of Annapolis	78.0%	84,731	5,614	18,034	250	108,629	78.0%	5.2%	16.6%	0.2%
Antigonish & Area Homemakers	83.5%	76,856	4,278	10,662	247	92,043	83.5%	4.6%	11.6%	0.3%
F & C S of Colchester	75.0%	144,827	43,599	4,677	0	193,103	75.0%	22.6%	2.4%	0.0%
F & C S of Cumberland	81.0%	98,865	20,540	0	2,651	122,056	81.0%	16.8%	0.0%	2.2%
Dartmouth Community Homemakers	75.0%	149,044	0	46,032	3,649	198,725	75.0%	0.0%	23.2%	1.8%
Family Service of Support	75.0%	128,260	0	0	42,753	171,013	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Homemakers Bureau	75.0%	107,314	2,840	32,680	251	143,085	75.0%	2.0%	22.8%	0.2%
F & C S of Lunenburg	75.0%	143,216	30,624	14,800	2,315	190,955	75.0%	16.0%	7.8%	1.2%
New Waterford Homemakers	93.0%	167,898	1,868	10,770	0	180,536	93.0%	1.0%	6.0%	0.0%
Northside Homemakers	81.0%	74,582	4,993	10,654	1,848	92,077	81.0%	5.4%	11.6%	2.0%
Pictou Co Visiting Homemakers	78.0%	111,254	0	26,892	4,487	142,633	78.0%	0.0%	18.9%	3.1%
Queens Co Homemakers	75.0%	81,395	25,987	1,145	0	108,526	75.0%	23.9%	1.1%	0.0%
Red Cross Homemakers	75.0%	288,654	0	96,218	0	384,872	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
St. Marys Homemaker Service	84.0%	96,740	0	18,427	0	115,167	84.0%	0.0%	16.0%	0.0%
Sydney Homemakers Society	75.0%	104,158	17,687	15,651	1,381	138,877	75.0%	12.7%	11.3%	1.0%
Totals Private Agencies		1,857,794	158,029	306,642	59,832	2,382,297	78.0%	6.6%	12.9%	2.5%
Grand Totals		3,460,755	543,569	343,294	70,335	4,417,953	78.3%	12.3%	7.8%	1.6%

FUNDING OPTION 2
STANDARDIZED SHARING RATIO OF 75/25 WITHOUT UNIVERSAL USER FEE
Applied to Data From the Fiscal Year 1987/88

TABLE 3

Name of Homemaker Agency	Sharing Ratio	Calculated 1987/88 Contributions Province	Munic	User	Other	Total	Contribution Percentage Prov	Munic	User	Other
Antigonish County	75.0%	23,504	7,835	0	0	31,339	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Munic of Argyle	75.0%	76,020	25,340	0	0	101,360	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Barrington/Clarks Harbour	75.0%	41,841	13,947	0	0	55,788	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
District of Clare	75.0%	38,141	12,714	0	0	50,855	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Digby County	75.0%	59,102	19,701	0	0	78,803	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Digby	75.0%	28,256	7,849	382	1,188	37,675	75.0%	20.8%	1.0%	3.2%
Dominion Visiting Homemakers	75.0%	24,714	5,789	2,449	0	32,952	75.0%	17.6%	7.4%	0.0%
Town of Glace Bay	75.0%	93,357	21,072	9,047	1,000	124,476	75.0%	16.9%	7.3%	0.8%
Guysborough County	75.0%	90,848	30,283	0	0	121,131	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Halifax County	75.0%	266,407	81,076	0	7,726	355,209	75.0%	22.8%	0.0%	2.2%
City of Halifax	75.0%	121,504	40,123	378	0	162,005	75.0%	24.8%	0.2%	0.0%
Inverness County	75.0%	80,769	19,283	6,971	589	107,692	75.0%	18.0%	6.5%	0.5%
Kings County	75.0%	96,412	29,342	2,795	0	128,549	75.0%	22.8%	2.2%	0.0%
Town of Lockeport	75.0%	5,375	1,792	0	0	7,167	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Mulgrave	75.0%	19,249	6,416	0	0	25,665	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Port Hawesbury	75.0%	40,321	9,861	3,579	0	53,761	75.0%	18.3%	6.7%	0.0%
Richmond County	75.0%	69,269	16,653	6,437	0	92,358	75.0%	18.0%	7.0%	0.0%
Munic of Shelburne	75.0%	2,994	998	0	0	3,992	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Town of Shelburne	75.0%	11,946	3,982	0	0	15,928	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hants Co Hommakers	75.0%	227,814	71,324	4,614	0	303,752	75.0%	23.5%	1.5%	0.0%
Town of Yarmouth	75.0%	38,938	12,979	0	0	51,917	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yarmouth County	75.0%	69,962	23,321	0	0	93,282	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Totals Municipal Agencies		1,526,742	461,759	36,652	10,503	2,035,656	75.0%	22.7%	1.8%	0.5%
F & C S of Annapolis	75.0%	81,472	8,873	18,034	250	108,629	75.0%	8.2%	16.6%	0.2%
Antigonish & Area Homemakers	75.0%	69,032	12,102	10,662	247	92,043	75.0%	13.1%	11.6%	0.3%
F & C S of Colchester	75.0%	144,827	43,599	4,677	0	193,103	75.0%	22.6%	2.4%	0.0%
F & C S of Cumberland	75.0%	91,542	27,863	0	2,651	122,056	75.0%	22.8%	0.0%	2.2%
Dartmouth Community Homemakers	75.0%	149,044	0	46,032	3,649	198,725	75.0%	0.0%	23.2%	1.8%
Family Service of Support	75.0%	128,260	0	0	42,753	171,013	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Homemakers Bureau	75.0%	107,314	2,840	32,680	251	143,085	75.0%	2.0%	22.8%	0.2%
F & C S of Lunenburg	75.0%	143,216	30,624	14,800	2,315	190,955	75.0%	16.0%	7.8%	1.2%
New Waterford Homemakers	75.0%	135,402	34,364	10,770	0	180,536	75.0%	19.0%	6.0%	0.0%
Northside Homemakers	75.0%	69,058	10,517	10,654	1,848	92,077	75.0%	11.4%	11.6%	2.0%
Pictou Co Visiting Homemakers	75.0%	106,975	4,279	26,892	4,487	142,633	75.0%	3.0%	18.9%	3.1%
Queens Co Homemakers	75.0%	81,395	25,987	1,145	0	108,526	75.0%	23.9%	1.1%	0.0%
Red Cross Homemakers	75.0%	288,654	0	96,218	0	384,872	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
St. Marys Homemaker Service	75.0%	86,375	0	28,792	0	115,167	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
Sydney Homemakers Society	75.0%	104,158	17,687	15,651	1,381	138,877	75.0%	12.7%	11.3%	1.0%
Totals Private Agencies		1,786,723	218,735	317,007	59,832	2,382,297	75.0%	9.2%	13.3%	2.5%
Grand Totals		3,313,465	680,494	353,659	70,335	4,417,953	75.0%	15.4%	8.0%	1.6%

TABLE 4

FUNDING OPTION 3
CURRENT SHARING RATIOS WITH UNIVERSAL USER FEE
Applied to Data From the Fiscal Year 1987/88

Name of Homemaker Agency	Sharing Ratio	Province	Calculated 1987/88 Contribution Munic	User	Other	Total	Contribution Percentage Prov	Munic	User	Other
Antigonish County	92.0%	28,832	1,615	892	0	31,339	92.0%	5.2%	2.8%	0.0%
Munic of Argyle	81.3%	82,406	0	18,954	0	101,360	81.3%	0.0%	18.7%	0.0%
Barrington/Clarks Harbour	85.0%	47,420	1,517	6,851	0	55,788	85.0%	2.7%	12.3%	0.0%
District of Clare	88.0%	44,752	747	5,355	0	50,855	88.0%	1.5%	10.5%	0.0%
Digby County	82.0%	64,618	6,231	7,953	0	78,803	82.0%	7.9%	10.1%	0.0%
Town of Digby	75.0%	28,256	3,290	4,941	1,188	37,675	75.0%	8.7%	13.1%	3.2%
Dominion Visiting Homemakers	75.0%	24,714	3,092	5,146	0	32,952	75.0%	9.4%	15.6%	0.0%
Town of Glace Bay	75.0%	93,357	11,359	18,760	1,000	124,476	75.0%	9.1%	15.1%	0.8%
Guysborough County	91.0%	110,229	0	10,902	0	121,131	91.0%	-0.0%	9.0%	0.0%
Halifax County	78.0%	277,063	42,791	27,629	7,726	355,209	78.0%	12.0%	7.8%	2.2%
City of Halifax	75.0%	121,504	34,374	6,127	0	162,005	75.0%	21.2%	3.8%	0.0%
Inverness County	75.0%	80,769	16,410	9,924	589	107,692	75.0%	15.2%	9.2%	0.5%
Kings County	75.0%	96,412	17,026	15,112	0	128,549	75.0%	13.2%	11.8%	0.0%
Town of Lockeport	75.0%	5,375	565	1,227	0	7,167	75.0%	7.9%	17.1%	0.0%
Town of Mulgrave	81.0%	20,789	2,561	2,315	0	25,665	81.0%	10.0%	9.0%	0.0%
Town of Port Hawesbury	75.0%	40,321	8,724	4,716	0	53,761	75.0%	16.2%	8.8%	0.0%
Richmond County	75.0%	69,269	8,707	14,383	0	92,358	75.0%	9.4%	15.6%	0.0%
Munic of Shelburne	75.0%	2,994	350	648	0	3,992	75.0%	8.8%	16.2%	0.0%
Town of Shelburne	75.0%	11,946	1,255	2,727	0	15,928	75.0%	7.9%	17.1%	0.0%
Hants Co Homemakers	77.0%	233,889	25,801	44,062	0	303,752	77.0%	8.5%	14.5%	0.0%
Town of Yarmouth	81.3%	42,209	310	9,398	0	51,917	81.3%	0.6%	18.1%	0.0%
Yarmouth County	81.3%	75,838	5,478	11,965	0	93,282	81.3%	5.9%	12.8%	0.0%
Totals Municipal Agencies		1,602,961	192,204	229,987	10,503	2,035,656	78.7%	9.4%	11.3%	0.5%
F & C S of Annapolis	78.0%	84,731	10,675	12,973	250	108,629	78.0%	9.8%	11.9%	0.2%
Antigonish & Area Homemakers	83.5%	76,856	8,231	6,709	247	92,043	83.5%	8.9%	7.3%	0.3%
F & C S of Colchester	75.0%	144,827	21,218	27,057	0	193,103	75.0%	11.0%	14.0%	0.0%
F & C S of Cumberland	81.0%	98,865	12,118	8,422	2,651	122,056	81.0%	9.9%	6.9%	2.2%
Dartmouth Community Homemakers	75.0%	149,044	22,077	23,955	3,649	198,725	75.0%	11.1%	12.1%	1.8%
Family Service of Support	75.0%	128,260	0	5,569	37,184	171,013	75.0%	-0.0%	3.3%	21.7%
Homemakers Bureau	75.0%	107,314	3,488	32,032	251	143,085	75.0%	2.4%	22.4%	0.2%
F & C S of Lunenburg	75.0%	143,216	16,656	28,768	2,315	190,955	75.0%	8.7%	15.1%	1.2%
New Waterford Homemakers	93.0%	167,898	0	12,638	0	180,536	93.0%	-0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
Northside Homemakers	81.0%	74,582	8,385	7,262	1,848	92,077	81.0%	9.1%	7.9%	2.0%
Pictou Co Visiting Homemakers	78.0%	111,254	11,894	14,998	4,487	142,633	78.0%	8.3%	10.5%	3.1%
Queens Co Homemakers	75.0%	81,395	10,905	16,226	0	108,526	75.0%	10.0%	15.0%	0.0%
Red Cross Homemakers	75.0%	288,654	0	96,218	0	384,872	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
St. Marys Homemaker Service	84.0%	96,740	0	18,427	0	115,167	84.0%	-0.0%	16.0%	0.0%
Sydney Homemakers Society	75.0%	104,158	16,395	16,944	1,381	138,877	75.0%	11.8%	12.2%	1.0%
Totals Private Agencies		1,857,794	142,041	328,199	54,263	2,382,297	78.0%	6.0%	13.8%	2.3%
Grand Totals		3,460,755	334,245	558,187	64,766	4,417,953	78.3%	7.6%	12.6%	1.5%

TABLE 5

FUNDING OPTION 4
STANDARDIZED SHARING RATIO OF 75/25 WITH UNIVERSAL USER FEE
Applied to Data From the Fiscal Year 1987/88

Name of Homemaker Agency	Sharing Ratio	Calculated 1987/88 Contribution Province	Munic	User	Other	Total	Contribution Percentage Prov	Munic	User	Other
Antigonish County	75.0%	23,504	6,943	892	0	31,339	75.0%	22.2%	2.8%	0.0%
Munic of Argyle	75.0%	76,020	5,669	19,671	0	101,360	75.0%	5.6%	19.4%	0.0%
Barrington/Clarks Harbour	75.0%	41,841	7,096	6,851	0	55,788	75.0%	12.7%	12.3%	0.0%
District of Clare	75.0%	38,141	7,358	5,355	0	50,855	75.0%	14.5%	10.5%	0.0%
Digby County	75.0%	59,102	11,748	7,953	0	78,803	75.0%	14.9%	10.1%	0.0%
Town of Digby	75.0%	28,256	3,290	4,941	1,188	37,675	75.0%	8.7%	13.1%	3.2%
Dominion Visiting Homemakers	75.0%	24,714	3,092	5,146	0	32,952	75.0%	9.4%	15.6%	0.0%
Town of Glace Bay	75.0%	93,357	11,359	18,760	1,000	124,476	75.0%	9.1%	15.1%	0.8%
Guysborough County	75.0%	90,848	19,154	11,129	0	121,131	75.0%	15.8%	9.2%	0.0%
Halifax County	75.0%	266,407	53,448	27,629	7,726	355,209	75.0%	15.0%	7.8%	2.2%
City of Halifax	75.0%	121,504	34,374	6,127	0	162,005	75.0%	21.2%	3.8%	0.0%
Inverness County	75.0%	80,769	16,410	9,924	589	107,692	75.0%	15.2%	9.2%	0.5%
Kings County	75.0%	96,412	17,026	15,112	0	128,549	75.0%	13.2%	11.8%	0.0%
Town of Lockeport	75.0%	5,375	565	1,227	0	7,167	75.0%	7.9%	17.1%	0.0%
Town of Mulgrave	75.0%	19,249	4,101	2,315	0	25,665	75.0%	16.0%	9.0%	0.0%
Town of Port Hawesbury	75.0%	40,321	8,724	4,716	0	53,761	75.0%	16.2%	8.8%	0.0%
Richmond County	75.0%	69,269	8,707	14,383	0	92,358	75.0%	9.4%	15.6%	0.0%
Munic of Shelburne	75.0%	2,994	350	648	0	3,992	75.0%	8.8%	16.2%	0.0%
Town of Shelburne	75.0%	11,946	1,255	2,727	0	15,928	75.0%	7.9%	17.1%	0.0%
Hants Co Homemakers	75.0%	227,814	31,876	44,062	0	303,752	75.0%	10.5%	14.5%	0.0%
Town of Yarmouth	75.0%	38,938	3,581	9,398	0	51,917	75.0%	6.9%	18.1%	0.0%
Yarmouth County	75.0%	69,962	11,355	11,965	0	93,282	75.0%	12.2%	12.8%	0.0%
Totals Municipal Agencies		1,526,742	267,480	230,931	10,503	2,035,656	75.0%	13.1%	11.3%	0.5%
F & C S of Annapolis	75.0%	81,472	13,934	12,973	250	108,629	75.0%	12.8%	11.9%	0.2%
Antigonish & Area Homemakers	75.0%	69,032	16,055	6,709	247	92,043	75.0%	17.4%	7.3%	0.3%
F & C S of Colchester	75.0%	144,827	21,218	27,057	0	193,103	75.0%	11.0%	14.0%	0.0%
F & C S of Cumberland	75.0%	91,542	19,441	8,422	2,651	122,056	75.0%	15.9%	6.9%	2.2%
Dartmouth Community Homemakers	75.0%	149,044	22,077	23,955	3,649	198,725	75.0%	11.1%	12.1%	1.8%
Family Service of Support	75.0%	128,260	0	5,569	37,184	171,013	75.0%	-0.0%	3.3%	21.7%
Homemakers Bureau	75.0%	107,314	3,488	32,032	251	143,085	75.0%	2.4%	22.4%	0.2%
F & C S of Lunenburg	75.0%	143,216	16,656	28,768	2,315	190,955	75.0%	8.7%	15.1%	1.2%
New Waterford Homemakers	75.0%	135,402	26,249	18,885	0	180,536	75.0%	14.5%	10.5%	0.0%
Northside Homemakers	75.0%	69,058	13,909	7,262	1,848	92,077	75.0%	15.1%	7.9%	2.0%
Pictou Co Visiting Homemakers	75.0%	106,975	16,173	14,998	4,487	142,633	75.0%	11.3%	10.5%	3.1%
Queens Co Homemakers	75.0%	81,395	10,905	16,226	0	108,526	75.0%	10.0%	15.0%	0.0%
Red Cross Homemakers	75.0%	288,654	0	96,218	0	384,872	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
St. Marys Homemaker Service	75.0%	86,375	2,168	26,624	0	115,167	75.0%	1.9%	23.1%	0.0%
Sydney Homemakers Society	75.0%	104,158	16,395	16,944	1,381	138,877	75.0%	11.8%	12.2%	1.0%
Totals Private Agencies		1,786,723	198,668	342,643	54,263	2,382,297	75.0%	8.3%	14.4%	2.3%
Grand Totals		3,313,465	466,148	573,575	64,766	4,417,953	75.0%	10.6%	13.0%	1.5%

APPENDIX V

INCOME LEVELS FOR DETERMINING FEE

Family Size	A No Fee Below	B	C Full Fee Above
1 Person	$8,489	$10,790	$13,092
2 Persons	13,764	19,974	26,184
3 Persons	16,594	23,573	30,552
4 Persons	19,424	27,172	34,920
5 Persons	22,254	30,771	39,288
6 Persons	25,084	34,370	43,656

$2.25/visit for families with incomes between A and B

$4.50/visit for families with incomes between B and C